

REMARKS

In this response, claim 10 is cancelled, and no new claims have been added. Thus, claims 1, 3-6, 8, 9, 11-19, and 23-29 remain pending in this application. A few claims are amended as indicated above. The Office Action issued by the Examiner has been carefully considered.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

A. The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 3-6, 8, 9, 14-19, 23-29, over Poulsen (U.S. Patent No. 7,062,511) (hereinafter “Poulsen”), in view of Vittal et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,907,401) (hereinafter “Vittal”).

Applicant again kindly requests the Examiner first focus on independent claim 26, as discussed in Applicant’s prior response. Claim 26 recites two entities, a master entity and a subordinate entity. Before the subordinate entity first interacts with the master entity to request the creation of an on-line shopping mall, the master entity maintains an existing directory of providers (i.e., this directory includes “preexisting providers” that exist before the first visit by the subordinate entity).

During the creation of the shopping mall, a new directory is created that is a subset of the existing directory (i.e., the providers in the new directory are taken from the existing directory of providers). As an example, assume the existing directory includes providers A, B, C, D, E, and F. A new directory is created upon request on a website by the subordinate entity. The new directory may contain, for example, providers B, D, and F.

The Examiner is kindly and emphatically requested to appreciate here in this example that the subordinate entity was not aware of the providers B, D, and F prior to its visit to the website. It is the website operator or host (i.e., the master entity) that has

provided this network information for the providers B, D, and F to be used in the new shopping mall.

In contrast, the arguments by the Examiner, and the prior art cited, all relate to situations in which a user or website visitor (subordinate entity) has itself provided the providers B, D, and F. In other words, the prior art teaches that the user is aware of the “providers B, D, and F” prior to its first visit to the website. This, of course, would be true because, using the prior art teachings, the information for “providers B, D, and F” would be provided by the website user, and not from the website operator (master entity). In other words, the providers B, D, and F are not “originally associated with the master entity” prior to the first visit by the subordinate entity.

The Examiner cites Poulsen (at column 5: lines 15-22) as teaching providers originally associated with the master entity. However, again, this citation is only directed to information (preference data) being provided from the user (subordinate entity). There is no provider information taught as being provided from the website operator (master entity). Data from the user simply cannot be information for providers originally associated with the master entity.

Thus, in light of the above, Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner is misunderstanding Applicant’s prior arguments regarding “preexisting providers” (the arguments from Applicant’s response of March 16, 2009, are incorporated by reference in this response). Also, in the current office action, the Examiner states that the prior art does not show any preexisting providers. This is believed supportive of Applicant’s position stated above, which is that the prior art does not teach or suggest preexisting providers as claimed.

Because the prior art fails to show any preexisting providers as claimed, Applicant respectfully submits that a *prima facie* case of obviousness is not made here for claim 26.

Applicant believes that the other independent claims are allowable for similar reasons. Accordingly, Applicant requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

B. Claims 10-13 have been rejected over Poulsen-Vittal, and further in view of Feathers et al. (U.S. Application Publication No. 2002/0055933) (hereinafter "Feathers").

Claim 10 has been canceled. Applicant's claims 11-13 each depend, directly or indirectly, from independent claim 1, and are believed allowable at least for the reasons discussed above. Feathers does not remedy the deficiencies of Poulsen or Vittal discussed above.

CONCLUSION

Applicant's other claims not explicitly discussed above depend, directly or indirectly, from one of Applicant's independent claims discussed above, and are believed allowable for at least the respective reasons discussed above.

In view of the above, Applicant respectfully requests the reconsideration of this application and the allowance of all pending claims. It is respectfully submitted that the Examiner's rejections have been successfully traversed and that the application is now in order for allowance. Applicant believes that the Examiner's other arguments not discussed above are moot in light of the above arguments, but reserves the right to later address these arguments. Accordingly, reconsideration of the application and allowance thereof is courteously solicited.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees associated with this filing, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 50-2638. If an extension of time is required, this should be considered a petition therefor.

Respectfully submitted,



Bruce T. Neel
Reg. No. 37,406

Date: January 8, 2010

Customer Number 33717
GREENBERG TRAURIG, LLP
2450 Colorado Avenue, Suite 400E
Santa Monica, CA 90404
Phone: (602) 445-8339
Fax: (602) 445-8100
E-mail: neelb@gtlaw.com